

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 12 2005

Attorney's Docket 071419-0272813  
Client Reference: VI/96-068.RE.C

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re PATENT APPLICATION of:  
ARTHUR E UBER III ET AL.

Confirmation No: 2112

Application No.: 09/545,582

Group Art Unit: 3737

Filed: April 7, 2000

Examiner: Ruth S. Smith

Title: PATIENT INFUSION SYSTEM FOR USE WITH MRI

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION  
UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.8

I hereby certify that the following papers are being facsimile  
transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office at (703) 872-9306 on the date  
shown below:

Second Supplemental Amendment (Third Revision)

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP



JEFFREY D. KARCESKI  
Reg. No. 35914

Date: January 12, 2005  
P.O. Box 10500  
McLean, VA 22102  
Telephone: (703) 905-2000  
Facsimile: (703) 905-2500

(Certification of Facsimile Transmission—page 1)

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

**JAN 12 2005**

## REISSUE LITIGATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**In re Continuation Reissue  
Patent Application of:**

**Uber, III et al.**

Appln. No.: 09/545582

Filed: April 7, 2000

**Title: PATIENT INFUSION SYSTEM  
FOR USE WITH MRI**

Confirmation No. 2112

Group Art Unit: 3737

**Examiner: R. Smith**

\* \* \* \* \*

January 12, 2005

**SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL AMENDMENT**  
**(THIRD REVISION)**

**Commissioner for Patents**  
**P.O. Box 1450**  
**Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

Sir,

On January 11, 2005, the undersigned received a telephone call from Examiner Smith regarding the above captioned patent application. Examiner Smith informed the undersigned that the underlining and bracketing provided in the Second Supplemental Amendment (Second Revision), which was submitted to the Office on October 1, 2004, did not comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.173. In particular, Examiner Smith indicated that all changes to the claims and to the specification must be identified in each amendment and that the underlining and bracketing must compare with the originally-issued patent, not with the previous amendment. Accordingly, by this submission, the undersigned has altered the presentation of the claims to comply with the Examiner's request. In addition, the undersigned has reincorporated the changes made to the specification so that those changes are properly presented. The

30505134v1

**Uber, III et al. — Serial No. 09/545582 — Atty. Dkt. No. 071419/0272813**

remainder of this submission has not been altered from the Second Revision submitted on October 1, 2004.

As a supplement to the Supplemental Amendment filed on May 13, 2002, in the above-captioned patent application, in response to the paper mailed on September 7, 2004, and in response to the telephone conversation with Examiner Smith on January 11, 2005, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider the following amendments and new claims, all of which were previously submitted. This Second Supplemental Amendment (Third Revision) is being submitted before the issuance of a second office action in the above-captioned patent application.